

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

EE

25X1A6c

Chief, EE  
Attn: Chief, Finance Division  
Chief of Station, [REDACTED]

23 August 1956

25X1A6a

Administrative/Finance

Travel Reimbursement Policies

25X1A6c

REFERENCE: (A) [REDACTED]  
(B) [REDACTED]

25X1A

1. The requirement for KUBARK policy determination of general [REDACTED] regulations is well understandable and we are in complete accord with your comments relative to the necessity for these determinations being made in Headquarters in the interest of uniformity and assurance of equitable treatment of all employees. However, with respect to questions posed in Reference (B) we are somewhat at a loss to understand how our question "b" can be answered affirmatively and question "c" negatively. This is particular true in instances such as the case in point where no mention is made in the transmittal memoranda that certain clauses are to be implemented only if and when Headquarters considers them appropriate. It is submitted that in the absence of such a statement the Field can only assume that Headquarters concurs in the immediate adoption of the change.

2. Station policy with respect to the deduction for furnished quarters has been changed effective 14 August 1956. The ink was hardly dry on our previous dispatch of 17 July (Reference B) when we received the new complete revision of the Standardized Travel Regulations. As these were effective 1 August and there appeared little likelihood that an answer to our dispatch questions would be received in time, we forwarded [REDACTED] advising that the Station planned to implement the new regulations in their entirety 1 August unless Headquarters advised to the contrary. DIR 25146 of 13 August acknowledged this message and no objections were stated. Accordingly, an amended Station travel directive was published 14 August, copy of which is attached. Particular attention is invited to Paragraph IX C 3.

3. It is our considered opinion that this change has merit, is legally permissible, and should be allowed to stand notwithstanding Reference (A), paragraph 2, Comments. Actually, the only reference we can now find to a standard 20% deduction is [REDACTED] and, as presently worded, this regulation appears to us to be quite clear in stipulating that such deductions will be made from the prevailing per diem rate as contrasted to the interpretation contained in [REDACTED]. Incidentally, it was our impression that the ODD decision referred to

25X1A6c

25X1A

25X1A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Document No.	4
No. Change in Class.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Declassified	
Class. Changed To:	TS S (C)
Date:	10 OCT 1978

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Page 2

25X1A6c

in your earlier dispatch and in Reference (A) was based primarily on the amendment of 28 July 1955 at which time the standard 20% deduction requirement was eliminated from the Standardized Travel Regulations.

4. It will be noted that our Station policy as reflected in the attached directive provides that the deduction will be based on the rate. Therefore, from a practical standpoint the net result is just about the same. To illustrate, an employee in per diem status for one-half day who was furnished quarters through [redacted] facilities would have \$1.25 deducted under Station policies. Under the formula set forth in [redacted] the deduction would amount to \$1.00 (20% of \$5.00).

5. Additional factors which we would like you to consider in support of allowing our present policy to stand are:

- a. Your statement in Reference (A) that our policy as expressed in paragraph 5 of Reference (B) appears to have merit and will undoubtedly receive considerable support.
- b. Your statement that uniform and equitable treatment of all employees will undoubtedly require establishment of a standard deduction. It is felt that this is accomplished by the Station formula to a far greater extent than if we are forced to apply a flat 20% deduction for furnished quarters. Just within [redacted] there are varying rates for such facilities [redacted] and \$1.50, the latter change applicable to VIP quarters, [redacted] Under such conditions a standard deduction of 20% inevitably results in non-uniformity and inequity.
- c. The unique situation within [redacted] with respect to [redacted] billeting facilities. It is our understanding that this is one of the few areas in the world where extensive ODYOTE hotel-type accommodations are available.
- d. This change has been used to counter or ease the pain occasioned by the reduction in the per diem rate for rail travel. From an equity standpoint there appears little justification for paying \$12.00 per day for rail travel in the United States and \$6.00 within [redacted]

6. As it is imperative that this issue be clarified as quickly as possible, it would be appreciated if you would kindly cable a decision whether our policy can be allowed to stand.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1A2e

Concur:

25X1A2e